

### REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

The indication that claims 3 and 5 would be allowable if rewritten is greatly appreciated.

The rejection of claims 6, 9 and 10 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Okamura is respectfully traversed. For a prior art reference to anticipate in terms of 35 U.S.C. 102, every element of the claimed invention must be identically shown in a single reference. *In re Bond*, 15 USPQ2d 1566, 1567 (Fed. Cir. 1990). (Emphasis added.) As explained below, Okamura does not identically show every element of claim 6.

Claim 6 features a filter operably coupled in parallel with the servo controller. This feature is illustrated in Fig. 6 of the present application. Okamura discloses notch filter only in series with a loop compensator. See the Okamura disclosure explaining Figs. 3, 6, 8, 11 and 13. Since Okamura does not identically show a filter operably coupled in parallel with the servo controller as featured in claim 6, claim 6 is not anticipated. Therefore, claim 6 is allowable along with dependent claims 9 and 10.

The rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 8 and 11 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okamura in view of Waugh et al. is respectfully traversed.

Amended claim 1 features applying the compensation signal to control the moveable arm as a feedforward signal. The output from the notch filter disclosed in Okamura is not applied as a feedforward signal. Nor does Okamura suggest to apply the output as a feedforward signal. Waugh et al. also do not teach or suggest this feature. Therefore, claim 1 is not obvious and is allowable. Claims 2 and 4 are also allowable due to their dependence on allowable claim 1.

Claim 8 depends from claim 6. Similar to the explanation for claim 6, Okamura does not teach or suggest a filter operably coupled in parallel with the servo controller. Waugh et al. do not overcome this deficiency. And the Office Action does not present any objective evidence that teaches or suggests to modify Okamura with this feature, whether from the references alone or combined, or from knowledge possessed by one skilled in the art. Therefore, claim 8 is not obvious and is allowable.

The rejection of claim 7 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okamura in view of Ottesen et al. is respectfully traversed. Claim 7 depends from claim 6. As discussed above, Okamura does not disclose the parallel feature of claim 6. Furthermore, neither Okamura suggests nor Ottesen et al. teach or suggest this feature. Therefore, claim 6 is not


obvious and is allowable over these references. As such, claim 7 is not obvious and allowable due to its dependence on claim 6.

In light of the foregoing remarks, it is believed that the application is in condition for allowance and thus prompt allowance is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner have any remaining questions, he is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number below to expeditiously resolve such concerns.

Respectfully submitted,  
Seagate Technology LLC

Date

7/14/03

  
David K. Lucente, Reg. No. 36,202  
Seagate Technology LLC  
Intellectual Property Department – COL2LGL  
389 Disc Drive  
Longmont, CO 80503  
(720) 684-2295 (telephone)  
(720) 684-2588 (facsimile)

**COPY**

**Addendum**

**Attachment 1**

**Reducing Actuator Arm Oscillation During Settle Mode In A Disc Drive Servo System**

## **Addendum**

### **Attachment 1**

#### **Reducing Actuator Arm Oscillation During Settle Mode In A Disc Drive Servo System**